

REMARKS

The claims of the present application were subject to a restriction requirement, and claims 9-13 were elected for prosecution in this application. Accordingly, claims 1-8 have been cancelled. Applicant expressly reserves the right to file claims relating to the non-elected invention in a divisional application.

Applicant, by the amendments presented above and the arguments presented below, has made a concerted effort to present claims which clearly define over the prior art of record, and thus to place this case in condition for allowance. Claims 9-14 are currently pending. Claim 9 has been amended. Claim 14 is newly added.

Specification Amendments

Applicant has made numerous amendments to the specification for clarification purposes. No new matter has been included in the amendments made to the Specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art, as illustrated in Figure 4 of the application. Independent claim 9 has been amended to further distinguish the claimed invention from that which is disclosed as prior art in Figure 4.

Applicant has amended independent claim 9 to clarify that in the step of laying an array of die, that each die of the array of die is generally *identical* to the other dies of the array of die. Each die of the array of die is generally identical to the other dies of the array of die because they are a part of an HVR reticle, as defined in the application.

Conversely, Figure 4 illustrates a construction of an LVR reticle, not an HVR reticle. As

such, the LVR reticle 62 illustrated in Figure 4, and as explained on pages 11 and 12, is formed by laying down an array of die 64, which is formed of multiple layers of *different* dies 64a, 64b, 64c, 64d, and is formed in a square pattern.

Thus, as Applicant has amended independent claim 9 to require that the die in the array of die be identical (thus defining an IIVR reticle), rather than different (thus defining an LVR reticle), Applicant states that the admitted prior art of Figure 4 does not render amended independent claim 9 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent claim 9.

As Applicant states that independent claim 9 is in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 10 and 11 as they ultimately depend from independent claim 9.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 12 and 13 are allowed.

The Examiner objected to claim 11 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As such, Applicant has added new independent claim 14 which includes the limitations of independent claim 9 and dependent claim 11. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of new independent claim 14. Applicant did not amend dependent claim 11 into independent form to include all of the limitations of independent claim 9 because Applicant states that independent claim 9, as amended hereinabove, is now in condition for allowance and, thus, because claim 11 depends from independent claim 9, Applicant further states that claim 11 is also now in condition for


allowance.

In view of the above Amendments and Remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the application are allowable over the rejections of the Examiner. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact one of the undersigned attorneys at (312) 704-1890.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 16, 2004

By: _____


James R. Foley, Reg. No. 39,979
James A. O'Malley, Reg. No. 45,952
TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI,
BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.
105 W. Adams Street, 36th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 704-1890

747505